

REMARKS

Claims 1-23, 25, 27, and 30-39 were pending in the application at the time of examination.

Claims 1, 3, 5, 19, 22, 30, 33, 36 and 38 are amended. Applicant submits support for the amendments is found in the specification as filed, see for example, at least Applicant's FIGS. 1 and 3, and that no new matter has been added.

Claims 1-23, 25, 27, and 30-39 remain pending in the application.

Request for Examiner Interview

Should the Examiner be of the opinion that this amendment does not place the Application in a condition for allowance, Applicant respectfully requests an Examiner interview prior to issuance of the next communication from the USPTO to expedite prosecution.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC §102

Claims 1-12, 19-21, 30, and 32-35 are not anticipated by Pioch

In the Office Action at page 4, para. 10, the Examiner stated:

Claims 1-12, 19-21, 30, and 32-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Pioch ("A short IRC primer", Edition 1.1b, February 29, 1993).

Claims 1 and 2

Applicant has amended Claim 1.

With regard to Claim 1, the Examiner at pages 4-5, para. 11, asserts:

...Pioch discloses a system for synchronous collaborative shell integrated instant messaging comprising:...

...a collaborative shell program (pg. 4, sec. 1.1: paragraph 5, "IRC is based...", the server program

reads on "collaborative shell program"), the collaborative shell program linking a command line interface of a command line interface (CLI) shell program on one or more user computer systems (pg. 4, sec. 1.1: paragraph 5; client program reads on "CLI shell program on one or more user computer systems") to an instant messaging /chat capability of an IM server application (pg. 4, sec. 1.1: paragraph 5, server program reads on "IM server application") to permit a user of at least one user computer system to issue commands to at least one target computer system on the network via a chat window displayed to the user on the at least one user computer system (g. 5, sec. 1.4: paragraph 2, commands are entered via the CLI such commands including /INVITE and /KICK by clients which elicit responses from a target computer running a separate client application version of IRC (pg. 14, sec. 2.3: paragraphs 13-15: /INVITE <nickname> [<channel>] and page. 14, sec. 2.3: paragraphs 19-20: /KICK[<channel>] ,nickname.) IRC clients read on "a collaborative shell program")...

Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner's assertion.

Applicant respectfully submits the citations to Pioch relied on by the Examiner do not describe or suggest at least a collaborative shell program, the collaborative shell program linking a command line interface of a command line interface (CLI) shell program on one or more user computer systems to an instant messaging/chat capability of an IM server application on the IM server computer system to permit a user of at least one user computer system of the one or more user computer systems to issue commands to at least one target computer system on the network via a chat window displayed to the user on the at least one user computer system, wherein the at least one target computer system is coupled to the IM server computer system on the network.

For example, Pioch at page 12 describes that the commands /INVITE and /KICK are IRC "channel commands" and thus are IRC commands issued to the IRC server and are not issued to a

target computer system which is coupled to an IM server computer system.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits Claim 1 is not anticipated by Pioch and overcomes the Examiner's rejection. As Claim 2 depends from Claim 1, Applicant submits Claim 2 is also not anticipated by Pioch.

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the anticipation rejections of each of Claims 1 and 2.

Claims 3 and 4

Applicant has amended Claim 3.

With regard to Claim 3, Applicant respectfully submits that for at least reasons similar to Claim 1, Claim 3 is not anticipated by Pioch. As Claim 4 depends from Claim 3, Applicant submits Claim 4 is also not anticipated by Pioch.

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the anticipation rejections of each of Claims 3 and 4.

Claims 5-12

Applicant has amended Claim 5.

With regard to Claim 5, Applicant respectfully submits that for at least reasons similar to Claim 1, Claim 5 is not anticipated by Pioch. As Claims 6-12 depend from Claim 5, Applicant submits Claims 6-12 are also not anticipated by Pioch.

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the anticipation rejections of each of Claims 5-12.

Claims 19-21

Applicant has amended Claim 19.

With regard to Claim 19, Applicant respectfully submits that for at least reasons similar to Claim 1, Claim 19 is not anticipated by Pioch. As Claims 20-21 depend from Claim 19, Applicant submits Claims 20-21 are also not anticipated by Pioch.

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the anticipation rejections of each of Claims 19-21.

Claims 30 and 32

Applicant has amended Claim 30.

With regard to Claim 30, Applicant respectfully submits that for at least reasons similar to Claim 1, Claim 30 is not anticipated by Pioch. As Claim 32 depends from Claim 30, Applicant submits Claim 32 is also not anticipated by Pioch.

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the anticipation rejections of each of Claims 30 and 32.

Claims 33-35

Applicant has amended Claim 33.

With regard to Claim 33, Applicant respectfully submits that for at least reasons similar to Claim 1, Claim 33 is not anticipated by Pioch. As Claims 34 and 35 depend from Claim 33, Applicant submits Claims 34 and 35 are also not anticipated by Pioch.

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the anticipation rejections of each of Claims 33-35.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC §103

Claims 22-23, 25 and 27 are not obvious over Appelman in view of Canessa

In the Office Action at page 10, para. 25, the Examiner stated:

Claims 22-23, 25, and 27, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being anticipated by Appelman (US Pat. 6,677,968) in view of Canessa et al. (US Pub. No. 2004/0224772).

Applicant has amended Claim 22.

Applicant respectfully submits the citations to Appelman relied on by the Examiner do not describe or suggest at least one selectable identifier of a target computer system coupled to a network, the selectable identifier identifying a target computer system connectable to an IM server computer system in a synchronous collaborative shell integrated instant messaging session through a collaborative shell program on the IM server computer system, the collaborative shell program linking a command line interface of a command line interface (CLI) shell program on one or more user computer systems to an instant messaging/chat capability of an IM server application on the IM server computer system to permit a user of at least one user computer system of the one or more user computer systems to issue commands to the target computer system on the network via a chat window displayed to the user on the at least one user computer system, wherein the target computer system is coupled to the IM server computer system on the network.

For example, Appelman at col. 4, lines 9-18 describes:

FIG. 3 is a graphical display of one implementation of the invention, showing a Buddy List window 40 with a buddy list named "Home List" in a large scrollable area. Buddy list names are like categories. Other buddy lists can be shown in the same display. Indented underneath each buddy list are the names (or addresses) of user-selected co-users comprising that list. In the example shown, the "Home List" includes three co-users and their status as "IN" (i.e., currently logged into the system) or "OUT" (i.e., currently logged out of the system).

Applicant submits the citations to Appelman merely describe a buddy list showing names of user-selected co-users and their status as logged into or out of the system, and thus fails to describe or suggest at least a selectable identifier identifying a target computer system connectable to an IM server computer system in a synchronous collaborative shell integrated instant messaging session through a collaborative shell program on the IM server computer system.

The citations to Canessa fail to cure the deficiencies of Appelman.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits Claim 22 is not obvious over Appelman in view of Canessa. As Claims 23 and 25 depend from Claim 22, Applicant submits Claims 23 and 25 are also not obvious over Appelman in view of Canessa.

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the obviousness rejections of each of Claims 22-23 and 25.

Claims 13-18 are not obvious over Pioch in view of Appelman

Claim 13 is not obvious over Pioch in view of Appelman

In the Office Action at page 12, para. 30, the Examiner stated:

Claims 13-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pioch as applied to claims 5 and 12 above, and further in view of Appelman.

Claims 13-18 depend from Claim 5. Applicant respectfully submits that for at the least reasons earlier discussed with regard to Claim 5, Claims 13-18 are not described or suggested by Pioch. Further as earlier discussed, the citations to Appelman do not cure the deficiencies of Pioch.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 13-18 are not obvious over Pioch in view of Appelman.

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the obviousness rejections of each of Claims 13-18.

Claim 31 is not obvious over Pioch in view of McGee

In the Office Action at page 14, para. 37, the Examiner stated:

Claim 31 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pioch as applied to claim 30 above, and further in view of McGee et al (US Pub. No. 2004/0019701), hereafter "McGee".

Claim 31 depends from Claim 30. Applicant respectfully submits that for at least the reasons earlier discussed with regard to Claim 30 and Claim 1, Claim 31 is not described or suggested by Pioch. The citations to McGee fail to cure the deficiencies of Pioch.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 31 is not obvious over Pioch in view of McGee. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the obviousness rejection of Claim 31.

Claims 36-39 are not obvious over Appelman in view of Pioch

In the Office Action at page 15, para. 39, the Examiner stated:

Claims 36-39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Appelman in view of Pioch.

Claims 36 and 37 are not obvious over Appelman in view of Pioch

Applicant has amended Claim 36.

Applicant respectfully submits that for at least the reasons earlier discussed with regard to Claims 1 and 22, Claim 36 is not described or suggested by Pioch. Further, as earlier

discussed, the citations to Appelman do not cure the deficiencies of Pioch.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits Claim 36 is not obvious over Appelman in view of Pioch. As Claim 37 depends from Claim 36, Applicant submits Claim 37 is also not obvious over Appelman in view of Pioch.

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the obviousness rejections of each of Claims 36 and 37.

Claims 38 and 39 are not obvious over Appelman in view of Pioch

Applicant has amended Claim 38.

Applicant respectfully submits that for at least the reasons earlier discussed with regard to Claim 36, Claim 38 is not obvious over Appelman in view of Pioch. As Claim 39 depends from Claim 38, Applicant submits Claim 39 is also not obvious over Appelman in view of Pioch.

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the obviousness rejections of each of Claims 38 and 39.

Conclusion

For the foregoing reasons, Applicant(s) respectfully request allowance of all pending claims. If the Examiner has any questions relating to the above, the Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned Attorney for Applicant(s).

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on June 19, 2008.


Attorney for Applicant(s)

June 19, 2008
Date of Signature

Respectfully submitted,



Lisa A. Norris
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 44,976
Tel.: (831) 655-0880